Aëtius Placita 2.3

Εἰ ἔμψυχος ὁ κόσμος καὶ προνοία διοικούμενος

Witnesses

Ps. Plutarch 2.3, Eusebius 15.34, ps. Galen 46, Cyril c. Jul. 2.15, Qustā Ibn Luqa 2.3
Stobaeus 1.21.3c, 6a
Theodoret 4.16, cf. 1.63
Cf. Achilles 5

Analysis

1. The subject of the cosmos’ motion treated in the previous chapter raises the question of how that motion is caused. The progression to the theme of the cosmos’ ensoulment is thus a natural one. The basic question here is whether the cosmos is a living being (ζωον), or not.

2. P preserves the following text with three doxai:

γ’. Εἰ ἔμψυχος ὁ κόσμος καὶ προνοία διοικούμενος

P2.3.1 οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι πάντες ἔμψυχον τὸν κόσμον καὶ προνοία διοικούμενον.

P2.3.2 Δημόκριτος δὲ καὶ Ἑπίκουρος καὶ ὁσιοὶ τὰ ἁτόμα εἰσηγούνται καὶ τὸ κενὸν οὕτ’ ἔμψυχον οὔτε προνοία διοικεῖσθαι, φύει δὲ τινὶ ἄλλῳ.

P2.3.3 Ἄριστοτέλης οὕτ’ ἔμψυχον ὅλον δι’ ὅλων, οὔτε μὴν αἰσθητικῶν οὔτε λογικῶν οὔτε νοερῶν οὔτε προνοίας διοικούμενον τὰ μὲν γὰρ οὐράνια τῶν ἁπάντων κοινωνεῖν, σφαιρὰς γὰρ περιέχειν ἔμψυχοι καὶ ζωοῖς, τὰ δὲ περίγεια μηδενὸς αὐτῶν, τῆς δ’ ἐνταξιας κατὰ συμβεβηκός οὐ προηγούμενον μετέχειν.

Of the subsidiary witnesses E omits the first lemma. This is most unexpected, especially since it means that he misses the main διαφωνία, which he emphasized in the introductory words at PE 15.32.8 (2.406.8–9 Mras). He may have felt that its wording was too similar to the chapter heading. Or he may have followed the practice of other Christian sources, which leave out the majority position because it is the same as their own (see texts below). G paraphrases and makes significant alterations to the last two lemmata, e.g. changing the final words of
the Aristotelian doxa from κατὰ συμβεβηκός οὗ προηγουμένως μετέχειν
to μετεληφέναι μήτε προηγουμένως μήτε κατὰ συμβεβηκός. He shares a
shorter title without the second subject with some mss. of P, but there
can be no doubt that A had the longer title. Cyril is the most faithful
witness. He agrees with E (but not Q) in omitting οὔτε μὴν αἰσθητούν
in the final doxa (G has αἰσθητόν only). We shall discuss this variant
further in sect. 9 below.

3. In S the material from this chapter is found in 1.21. A clear reference
to A’s title is made in the chapter’s heading, which, as we saw in our
analysis of ¶1, is a composite of the headings of A 2.1, 2.3, 2.5a* and
2.5. After citing a cluster of Stoic material from 2.1, 2.4, and 2.6, S
quotes the first two lemmata, which contain the main diaeresis:

| 1.21 title | Περὶ κόσμου καὶ εἰ ἔμψυχος καὶ προνοία διοικούμενος καὶ ποῦ
|            | ἔχει τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν καὶ πόθεν τρέφεται
| 1.21.3c   | οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι πάντες ἔμψυχον τὸν κόσμον (καὶ) προνοία διοικούμε-
|            | νον.
| S1         | Λεύκιππος δὲ καὶ Δημόκριτος καὶ ᾿Επίκουρος οὐδέτερα τῶν,
|            | φύσει δὲ ἀλόγῳ ἐκ τῶν ἀτόμων συνεστώτα.
| S2         | Ὅσον οὖν λόγως καὶ ἀτομίκας

The first lemma is thus identical to what we find in P, but the second
adds the name-label of Leucippus at the beginning and differs from P
in the wording of the doxa, with only the words φύσει δὲ ἀλόγῳ held
in common. S then continues with an excerpt on Homeric cosmology
which shows similarities to what we find in ps.Plutarch’s Vita Homerī
(§ 4),113 followed by a long Chrysippean excerpt from AD on the cosmos
(§ 5). He then continues with material from our chapter:

| 1.21.6ab  | Ὅσον λόγως καὶ ἀτομίκας
| S3         | ᾿Αριστοτέλης οὔτ’ ἔμψυχον ὅλων δι’ ὅλου, οὔτε λογικὸν οὔτε
|            | νοερὸν οὔτε προνοία διοικούμενον· τὰ μὲν γὰρ σύφανα πάντων
|            | τοῖσ’ αὐτῶν, σφαίρας γὰρ περίεχεν ἔμψυχος καὶ ᾿Ωστιάκας,
|            | τὰ δὲ περίγεια μηδὲνος αὐτῶν, τῆς δ’ εὐταξίας κατὰ συμβεβη-
|            | κόσα

There can be no doubt that the additional Ecphantus lemma belongs
to our chapter. The text of the fairly long Aristotelian doxa differs

---

113 Attributed by Diels DG 852 to ps.Plutarch (cf. 88–99) and taken over by Wach-
muth.